

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Applicants have submitted herewith 12 replacement sheets, which comprise a formal set of drawings. The drawing on Replacement sheet 3/12 has been amended to change the Figure numeral from “3” to “3a”, as requested.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner's indication that claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12 and 16 include allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten as suggested in the Office Action.

By the above amendment, claims 1, 3 and 8-17 have been amended. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objections and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

#### **Drawing Objections**

The drawings were objected to for the reasons (a) ~ (d) as set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants have submitted herewith 12 replacement sheets comprising a formal set of drawings, which addresses the drawing objections (c) and (d). Moreover, in response to drawing objection (b), Applicants have relabeled Figure 3 as "FIG. 3a". With respect to drawing objection (a), it is respectfully submitted that the header text falls within the required drawing margins (along with the notations "Replacement Sheet"). Accordingly, there is no need or requirement to remove such text. The text is maintained for identification purposes. Based on the above, withdrawal of the drawing objections is requested.

#### **Claim Objections**

The claims were objected to for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Again, applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter.

With respect to objection of claims 3 and 11 based on the term "effected", it is respectfully submitted that the term "effected" is proper within the context of the claim (wherein the term "affected" as requested by the Examiner is not). If Examiner disagrees, Applicants

respectfully request the Examiner to look up the term “effected” in any standard English dictionary. Withdrawal of the claim objections is requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 3, 8, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons (a) and (b) set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. With respect to (b), the claims have been amended to provide antecedent basis. With respect to (a), Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The term “hypothetical” does not render the claim ambiguous. The terms “hypothetical number of shareable requests” and “hypothetical number of unshareable requests” are actually clearly defined by the variables set forth within the claims, as well as in the specification. As such, there is no basis for Examiner’s contention that such terms have not been defined. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-10, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,849 to Carlson, for the reasons set forth on pages 4-5 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that at the very minimum, claims 1 and 9 are patentably distinct and patentable over Carlson.

Indeed, on a *fundamental level*, Carlson does not teach or suggest methods for controlling web farms as contemplated by the claim, wherein a plurality of website in the web farm can share servers assigned to different web sites for processing client requests. Carlson discloses nothing more than a method or load balancing among a plurality of backend application servers for a given website. (see, e.g., FIG. 2A of Carlson and accompany description). At the very least, the Examiner has not even demonstrated how Carlson discloses multiple websites.

Moreover, Carlson does not disclose *categorizing customer requests received from said plurality of websites into a plurality of categories, said categories comprising shareable customer requests which can be processed by servers of different websites and unshareable customer requests which can not be processed by servers of different websites*, as essentially recited in claims 1 and 9. The “sticky requests” relied on by Examiner relate only to requests that are processed by a specific backend application server of a cluster of backend application servers for a given website, and are not analogous to the claimed “unsharable customer requests”.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1 and 9 are not anticipated by Carlson. Moreover, claims 2, 7, 10 and 15 are not anticipated by Carlson at least by virtue of their dependence on respective base claims 1 or 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the anticipation rejections is requested.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

The following obviousness rejections were asserted in the Office Action:

- (i) Claims 5 and 13 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Carlson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,806,065 to Lomet;
- (ii) Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Carlson in view of Lomet and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,595 to Gilbert; and
- (iii) Claim 17 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Carlson in view of Lomet.

Each of the above obviousness rejections (i) and (ii) is based, in part, on the contention that Carlson discloses the inventions of claims 1 and 9. Therefore, in view of the readily apparent deficiencies of Carlson as noted above with respect to claims 1 and 9, the obviousness

rejections are legally deficient on their face. Moreover, it is readily apparent that neither Lomet nor Gilbert cure the deficiencies of Carlson in this regard.

For similar reasons discussed above, claim 17 is patentable and nonobvious over the combination of Carlson and Lomet. Indeed, at the very least, such combination does not disclose or suggest a web farm that comprises *a plurality of websites each having one or more servers assigned thereto*, much less, *means for categorizing said customer requests received from said plurality of websites into a plurality of categories, said categories comprising shareable customer requests which can be processed by servers of different websites and unshareable customer requests which can not be processed by servers of different websites*, as essentially recited in claim 17.

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa  
Reg. No. 43,584  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL.: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889